

## COMMENT SET 13: SANTA BARBARA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

24

1 All right, the next speaker slip I have is for a  
2 Connie Hannah, representing the League of Women Voters.

3 MS. HANNAH: A battery of microphones. Which one  
4 do I use.

5 MR. STRAIT: The big one.

6 MS. HANNAH: Thank you. I'm Connie Hannah,  
7 speaking for the Santa Barbara League of Women Voters. The  
8 League is very pleased that the State Lands Commission is  
9 conducting this hearing in Goleta, today. We hope that the  
10 future lease renewal can also be heard here, so that local  
11 people, who have been long involved, can comment on it.

12 This appears to be a thorough, readable draft.  
13 For the non-technical reader, it's quite obvious that the no  
14 project alternative, using onshore pipeline transport, is  
15 the environmentally superior choice. It would reduce all of  
16 the Class I impacts. That is shown clearly on Table ES-2,  
17 which compares the impacts from continued use of the EMT  
18 with the preferred alternative.

T-4

19 We do not think that the truck transportation  
20 project could ever be approved, because both the State and  
21 the county now require that all oil be transported by  
22 pipeline. With the serious congestion on Highway 101, we do  
23 not believe that any local government could approve trucking  
24 this crude oil to Carpinteria. The League has consistently  
25 supported pipeline transport of all oil products, and we

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION  
3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240, SACRAMENTO, CA 95827 / (916) 362-2345

1 would certainly do so in this case.

2 The League has long been asking for a termination  
3 of the Ellwood Marine Terminal. The dangers to the ocean  
4 waters and the Channel resources from using the barge are  
5 obvious. Your charts that you recently put on the board,  
6 that show the possible impacts of a spill on the resources  
7 of the Channel and the coastline are very good.

8 The onshore components were constructed in the  
9 1920's and they have required many repairs. In the  
10 meantime, this entire area has been built up and includes  
11 the very sensitive population of young children that you  
12 mention in the Draft EIR. However, you do not mention the  
T-5 13 fact that this population would be almost impossible to  
14 evacuate quickly in case of explosion and fire from the EMT.

15 Although the UCSB Child Care Center and the Isla  
16 Vista Elementary School are outside the direct hazardous  
T-6 17 footprint for the EMT, we still think that they could easily  
18 be affected by an accident there because they are not much  
19 more than a mile away.

20 In addition, as noted in the EIR, UCSB plans to  
21 build additional faculty and study housing very near this  
22 industrial site, very soon.

23 The League considers it important that, in spite  
24 of any proposed mitigations, the renewal of this project  
25 continues to have serious, unmitigatable Class I impacts.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION  
3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240, SACRAMENTO, CA 95827 / (916) 362-2345

**RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET 13: SANTA BARBARA LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS**

1 T-4 The State and local requirement for pipeline transportation of crude oil  
2 pertains specifically to new offshore oil and gas development projects.  
3 Truck transportation of crude oil has been found to have substantially  
4 greater impacts than pipeline transportation and was not considered  
5 environmentally preferable (see page ES-24, lines 20-22 of the DEIR).

6 T-5 Evacuations of the sensitive receptors have not been addressed  
7 because they are located significantly outside the impact zones of the  
8 worst case scenarios. See T-6 below.

9 T-6 The sensitive populations, such as the child care and the IV School are  
10 located about a mile away from the marine terminal facilities. Please  
11 refer to Table 4.2-1 at page 4.2-4 of the DEIR. The EMT facilities do not  
12 handle highly toxic gases, large volumes of gas liquids or large volumes  
13 of high pressure flammable materials and, therefore, their impact zones  
14 are not as large as many other industrial facilities. Facilities such as  
15 large ammonia refrigeration facilities, water treatment facilities utilizing  
16 large inventories of gaseous chlorine, or gas processing plants or  
17 refineries have worst case scenario zones exceeding a mile. The most  
18 hazardous scenario associated with an accident at the EMT would be a  
19 tank release with subsequent fire or toxic vapors. These sensitive  
20 receptors would not be impacted by a fire or toxic vapors at the EMT as  
21 the radiation or toxic effects would only reach distances of  
22 approximately 350 feet. See the discussion of "Acute Human Impacts"  
23 beginning at page 4.2-28 of the DEIR.